

DEC 01 1999

2

3

4

5

6

1...

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

2

3

4

MS. KNOPICK: Suellen Knopick. I'm not going

to be near as well spoken as the people that went before

me, but I do want to say for the public record the main

things that I find wrong with this EIS.

It's disturbing that \$7 billion and 15 years

later that we are left with one option and that option is

Yucca Mountain. And it's very clear in the EIS that the

DOE is not considering the no action alternative at all.

I find that the most major flaw with this whole process,

and I think everybody else has said very clearly that

we're left with no alternative at all.

Basically this EIS has become a statement of

plan and a recitation of concerns, and I don't believe

that it solves either one of those or addresses either one

of those as well.

First off, nowhere in there does it really

discuss the design of these canisters in any way that's

satisfactory. The canisters are stated as temporary and

then disposable canisters, and it doesn't really state in

any explicit way what those canisters are going to look

like, how they are going to be made safe from accidents

during transportation or anything like that. I would

think that that was one of the most major things an EIS is

required to lay out, and it disturbs me that it's not.

Secondly, it just strikes any sane person as

totally crazy to take waste from eastern states all the

way across the United States and expose all that land, all

5 those people, all that animal life, to the risk inherent
6 in transportation. We have all heard of amazingly weird
7 things that have happened in transportation. I think we
8 can predict that that's where the first accident will
9 happen. And it disturbs me, and I think once Americans
10 know what the plan is to get it there, I think that's
11 going to be a major problem.

12 Consequently, you haven't addressed it well
13 in the EIS, and I'm not surprised.

4 14 Thirdly, it is also disturbing that in the
15 transportation section of the EIS the accident scenario
16 spans eight pages. That doesn't seem quite enough.

17 And when it does discuss the accident
18 scenarios, it discusses it in exposure in rems to people.
19 I don't think that near satisfies an EIS, in my mind.

20 Basically I think it comes down to one thing.
21 In my mind, an EIS cannot gauge or adequately explain the
22 consequences of an accident with high level nuclear waste.
23 I don't think any EIS can do that, and I don't think any
24 site can satisfy what we want it to do.

25 I don't envy the DOE in its attempt to work
...1 1 its way out of this box that it's got itself in, but I
2 don't believe that the people of Nevada are going to allow
3 this to happen, and I strongly advise you to find another
4 option. Thank you.